

LAW OFFICES
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
 1300 I Street, NW
 Washington, DC 20005

Telephone
 (202) 408-4000

Facsimile
 (202) 408-4400

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

TO

Name: Examiner Matsuichiro Shimizu
Firm: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
 Art Unit 2635

Fax No.: (703) 746-5952

Phone No.: (703) 306-5841

Date: January 8, 2003

Subject: In Re Application of: Jonathan Buckley et al.
 Application No.: 09/270,461

Filed: March 15, 1999

For: Electromechanical Safety System for a Firearm
 Group Art Unit: 2635

FROM

Name: Thomas H. Jenkins
Phone No.: (202) 408-4088

Fax # Verified by: mm

Pages (incl. this): 4

Our File No.: 08874.0001

Confirmation Copy to Follow: No

Message:

Dear Examiner Shimizu:

As I explained to you yesterday, the applicant would like to have an interview in this case (Application No. 09/270,461) at your earliest convenience. As you requested, I am forwarding a proposed interview agenda. Please give me a call at (202) 408-4088 to let me know when it would be convenient for us to meet with you and Mr. Horabik.

With best regards,

Thomas H. Jenkins
 Reg. No. 30,857

The interview
1/12/03
1 hr Inspt. - at
study of Doc.
011094

If there is a problem with this transmission, notify fax room at (202) 408-4174 or the sender at the number above.

This facsimile is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message by first-class mail to the above address.

PROPOSED INTERVIEW AGENDA

I. *Purpose*

To narrow the issues for appeal.

II. *Prior art*

The applicant would like to discuss the deficiencies in the prior art relied upon by the Examiner. In particular, the applicant would like to explain why those designs will not work and have never been constructed. The applicant has first-hand experience with some of these designs. In addition, the applicant would like to explain why the prior art cannot reasonably be combined as the Examiner has done.

III. *Applicant's invention*

Applicant would like to demonstrate the invention and how it differs from the prior art. The invention is a workable design that has been constructed and tested by the Kentucky State Police and recommended by the Governor of Kentucky to the White House (see attachments to this agenda).

IV. *Possible amended claim*

Applicant has carefully studied the final rejection and the comments that the Examiner has made in response to applicant's argument. Applicant notes that the Examiner has allowed certain claims (e.g., claims 17 and 18) that recite the engagement between the blocking assembling and the trigger and has suggested that other claims (e.g., claim 15) do not claim a motor that works "in combination with the gear train for generating the necessary mechanical torque to prevent rotation of the trigger."

In an effort to avoid an appeal, applicant would like to discuss the following amendment to claim 15:

15. (Amended) A safety system for a firearm, the firearm having a trigger and a handgrip located rearward of the trigger, the safety system comprising:

a blocking assembly, located forward of the trigger, including a gear train and a motor for driving the gear train, to prevent operation of the trigger by directly engaging the trigger;

a power source to supply power to the safety system; and

a power control unit, electrically connected to the blocking assembly and the power source, to control power supply from the power source to the blocking assembly to activate the blocking assembly.